XII. Future Regulatory Rulings

61. Does the fact that both paging carriers and ISPs generally receive traffic but do not originate traffic require that the traffic directed to each be treated the same for compensation purposes?

No. There are significant differences between paging carriers and ISPs that may properly result in different treatment of the traffic to each. Paging service providers are telecommunications carriers and exchange co-carriers with all of the regulatory obligations that attend those classifications. In contrast, ISPs have been specifically exempted from classification as telecommunications carriers, and the FCC repeatedly has ruled that ISPs are to be treated as "end-users" for regulatory purposes. This distinction can serve to alter rights to compensation. Additionally, a paging message terminates at a specific location which can be characterized as being either local or non-local. A call to an ISP enters the "Internet cloud" which means that the point of termination of the communication defies easy categorization in terms of locality. In light of these significant differences, the Commission need not treat traffic to paging companies and ISPs in identical fashion.

62. What should the Commission do on reconsideration in the paging interconnection proceeding?

The Commission should: (a) affirm its prior rulings regarding the basic entitlement of paging carriers to reciprocal compensation; (b) confirm the obligation of LECs to bear the usage sensitive and non-usage sensitive costs associated with the delivery of LEC-originated traffic to paging companies for local termination; and (c) abandon forevermore the vacated rule which singled paging companies out as the only CMRS carriers obligated to perform their own Total Element Long Run Incremental Cost ("TELRIC") studies in order to receive terminating compensation.

^{47/}Local Competition First Report at para. 995.

⁴⁸/For example, when a call involves a pager, the paging company is the terminating carrier. When a call involves an Internet user, the LEC or CLEC serving the ISP, not the ISP, is the terminating carrier.

63. What other actions should the Commission take to resolve paging/LEC interconnection issues?

The Commission should exercise the full limit of its jurisdiction under Section 332 of the Communications Act and establish a federal forum for setting the rates that CMRS carriers charge LECs for terminating traffic. Since the states are preempted under Section 332 of the Communications Act from regulating CMRS rates, and since the charge imposed by a paging carrier on a LEC for termination service is a CMRS rate, it should be deemed within the exclusive domain of the FCC.

<u>Index</u>

-A-	-D-
Arbitration	Dedicated Facilities
- Under Section 252 of the Act Q.27	- cost of Q.57
Appeal	- FX lines as
- of the Local Competition First Report to	- use of Q.56
the Eighth Circuit Q.34,Q.35	
- of the Local Competition First Report to	Definitions
the Supreme Court Q.17	- of Commercial Mobile Radio
	Service
-B-	- of CPNI Q.3
Benefits	- of End Office interconnection Q.48
- to LECs of serving paging	- of FX lines
carriers Q.26	- of LEC-originated traffic Q.30
Bill and Keep	- of local traffic Q.18,Q.19
- opposed by the LECs Q.33	- of one way messaging Q.1
	- of paging service provider Q.1
-C-	- of point of connection (POC) or
Chilling effect	point of interface (POI) Q.39
- of requiring cost studies Q.45	- of reciprocal compensation Q.32
Commercial Mobile Radio Service	- of Tandem level interconnection Q.48
(CMRS)	- of telecommunications carrier Q.2
- as a Telecommunications Service Q.4	- of telephone exchange service Q.5
- paging service as Q.4	- of Type 1 interconnection Q.48
Co-Carriers	- of Type 2 interconnection Q.48
- paging service providers	Discrimination
asQ.5,Q.25,Q.54	- between payments to one-way and
Competition	two-way providers Q.47
- between one-way and two-way	- by LECs against paging carriers Q.9
companies Q.45,Q.46,Q.47	
Cost studies	-E-
- as a prerequisite to compensation Q.45	End Office (Type 1) Interconnection
Customer Proprietary Network	- defined Q.48
Information (CPNI)	- effect of numbering charges on Q.50
- obligation of paging carriers to	- reasons for continuing Q.51
protect Q.3	- converting to Type 2 Q.51

PCIA Q&A

-F-	- obligations of paging carriers Q.3
Facilities Charges	- rights of paging carriers to Q.7,Q.8
- entitlement of paging carriers to relief	- rights prior to the 1996 Act Q.7
from Q.21	- tandem level (Type 2) Q.48,Q.51
- extent of relief Q.22,Q.30	- type 1 (end office) Q.48
Federal Communications Commission	- type 2 (tandem level) Q.48,Q.51
- as arbiter of terminating	- under Sections 201/202 of the Act Q.7
compensation Q.14,Q.62	- under Sections 251/252 of the Act Q.8
- jurisdiction over intrastate	- under Section 332 of the ActQ.7
charges Q.10,Q.13	Internet Service Providers (ISPs)
- preemptive authority of Q.12	- compared to paging service
Fixed Costs	providers Q.61
- recovery of	- ISP traffic distinguished from
Foreign Exchange (FX) Lines	paging traffic Q.20
- defined	pusing dame
- purpose of Q.56	-J-
- replacement of	Jurisdiction
replacement of	- of FCC over intrastate
-G-	interconnection
Good Faith Estimate	- of states preempted Q.13
- as a basis for ascertaining local	of states preempted
traffic	-K-
_	-IX-
Good Faith Negotiations	-L-
- Section 252 request as a prerequisite	
to Q.27,Q.38	LATAs
	- inter-LATA interconnection
-Н-	restrictions Q.28,Q.29
Historical Reasons	LEC-Originated Traffic
- for selecting Type 1	- defined Q.30
interconnection	- local Q.13,Q.18
Historical Relationship	- obligation of paging carriers
- between LECs and paging	regarding Q.24
carriersQ.21	Local Competition First Report
	- appeals of theQ.34
-I-	- citation Q.2
Incentive	- effective date of
- to configure efficient network Q.24	- preemptive effect of Q.13
Interconnection	- statutory basis of Q.12
- End Office (Type 1) Q.48	- upheld on appeal Q.16

Local Exchange Carriers (LECs)	Network Architecture
- ability to assess charges for	- of one-way and two-way carriers
facilities Q.13	compared Q.46
- obligation to	- right of LEC to alter Q.25
interconnect Q.7,Q.8,Q.11	- right of LEC to dictate Q.25
- obligation to pay	Non-Traffic Sensitive Facility Costs
compensation Q.7,Q.31	- relief of paging carriers from
- record of compliance Q.9	paying Q.22
Local Service	Numbering Charges
- defined	- impact on interconnection type Q.50
Local Traffic	- reduction by federal mandate Q.13
- ascertaining the extent of Q.19	•
- defined	-O-
	One-Way Messaging
-M-	- as telephone exchange service Q.5
Mediation	- as local service Q.18
- Under Section 251/252 of the	- compared to Internet service . Q.20,Q.60
Act	- defined
Metzger Letter	- entitlement to reciprocal
- cited	compensation Q.31,Q.34,Q.35
- effect of the Q.22	Originating Carrier
Mid-Sized Incumbent LECs	- obligation to pay for facilities Q.23
- appeal of the Local Competition First	- obligation to pay compensation Q.21
Report by Q.35	
Minimum Requirements	-P-
- under sections 251/252 of the Act . Q.27	Paging Service
Modification of Final Judgment (MFJ)	- as CMRS Q.4
- effect on LEC obligations Q.5	- defined Q.1
Mutual compensation	- one call versus two calls Q.43
- entitlement of paging carriers to	Point of Connection (POC) or Point of
receive Q.31	Interface (POI)
	- defined
-N-	- location of Q.39
Negotiations	- effect of relocating Q.41
- good faith obligation Q.11	- effect on transport Q.42
- formal request as a prerequisite	Preemption
to Q.27,Q.38	- of conflicting state tariffs Q.12,Q.13
	- under the Supremacy Clause Q.12

PCIA Q&A

Private Branch Exchange (PBX)	Supreme Court
- comparison of paging carrier to Q.54	- review of the Local Competition First
	Report Q.17
-Q-	Switching Functions
-	- in an end office (Type 1)
-R-	interconnection Q.49
Radio Frequency (RF) Network	- in a tandem (Type 2)
- as the wireless local loop Q.36	interconnection
- entitlement to recover costs for Q.36	
Rating and Routing	- T -
- distinguished Q.59	Tandem Level (Type 2) Interconnection
- separation ofQ.60	- defined Q.48
Reciprocal Compensation	- separation of rating and routing
- defined	with Q.59
- entitlement of paging carriers to	- effect of converting from Type 1 Q.51
receive	Telecommunications Act
Reconsideration	- citation Q.1
- by the FCC of the First Report Q.62	- of 1996 Q.5
Reverse Billing	Telecommunications Carrier
- as an interconnection arrangement Q.53	- obligations of Q.3
- defined	- defined Q.2
	- paging carrier as Q.2
-S-	Telecommunications Service
Sections 201/202 of the Act	- defined
- interconnection rights created by Q.7	Telephone Exchange Service
Sections 251/252 of the Act	- paging carriers as providers of Q.5
- interconnection rights created by Q.8	- defined
Sections 332 of the Act	Terminating Compensation
- interconnection rights created by Q.7	- entitlement of paging carrier to
Section 51.703 of the FCC Rules	receive
- effective date	- request to negotiate as a
- interconnection rights created by Q.13	prerequisite Q.38
State Regulation	- reciprocal/mutual defined Q.32
- of CMRS rates and entry Q.63	Toll Revenues
- preempted Q.13,Q.14	- impact of FX lines on Q.56
Supremacy Clause	- LEC entitlement to intra-LATA
- preemption under the Q.12	toll

PCIA Q&A

Traffic Flow
- effect of imbalance on
compensation Q.33
Traffic Sensitive Facility Costs
- relief of paging carriers from
paying Q.22
Type 1 (End Office) Interconnection
- defined Q.48
- effect of numbering charges on Q.50
- reasons for continuing Q.51
- converting to Type 2 Q.51
Type 2(Tandem Level) Interconnection
- defined Q.48
- separation of rating and routing
with
- effect of converting from Type 1 Q.51

-U-
Unbundling
- rating and routing separation Q.62
Uneven Traffic Flow
- effect on compensation Q.33
Universal Service Fund
- obligation of paging carriers to
contributeQ.3
-V-
- v -
-W-
Wide Area Systems
- local service overQ.18
- local service over
-X-
~~
-Y-
**
7